



Special Committee on Targeting Resources

Agenda Packet

Governor
Arnold Schwarzenegger

Chair
Lawrence Gottlieb

Executive Director
Brian McMahon

Tuesday
April 18, 2006
10:00 a.m. — 12:30 p.m.
Teleconference Sites:

Sacramento Employment and Training Agency
925 Del Paso Boulevard, Shasta Room
Sacramento, California

Mount San Antonio College
Learning Technology Center
1100 N. Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA



Lawrence Gotlieb
Chair

Christine Essel
Vice Chair

Special Committee on Targeting Resources

TELECONFERENCE MEETING NOTICE

**Tuesday, April 18, 2006
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

Teleconference Sites:

**Sacramento Employment and Training Agency
925 Del Paso Boulevard, Shasta Room
Sacramento, CA**

**Mount San Antonio College
Learning Technology Center
1100 N. Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA**



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Brian McMahon
Executive Director

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
 - **Barry Sedlik, Chair**
- 2. Action - Approval of the January 12, 2006 Meeting Summary
Approval of the March 2, 2006 Meeting Summary**
- 3. Discussion Item – Committee Short- and Long-Term Goals**
- 4. Discussion Item – Conflict of Interest Overview**
- 5. Discussion Item – Update on Workgroup Progress for the Following Initiatives:**
 - **Advancing Employed Minimum Wage Workers**
 - **Workforce Development Needs in the Logistics Industry**
- 6. Discussion Item – Committee Initiative Assessment Tool**
- 7. Discussion Item – Update on Work of Other Committees**
- 8. Public Comment**
- 9. Next Steps**
- 10. Other Business that May Come Before the Committee**

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn.

In order for the Special Committee to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public hearings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Special Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply.

Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.calwia.org> or contact Danny Patterson for additional information.

**California Workforce Investment Board
Targeting Resources Committee
January 12, 2006 Meeting Summary**

**California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) Members and Committee Members
Attending**

Barry Sedlik, Chair
Mike Curran, Vice Chair
Ada Carrillo
Mark Hanson for Jerry Butkiewicz
Sean Liou
Francis Low for Richard Alarcon
Dwight Nixon
Wayne Schell
David Villarino for Arturo Rodriguez

Board Staff, Partner Staff and Contributors Attending:

Partner Staff:
Michelle Alford-Williams, Department of Rehabilitation
Linda Rogaski, Employment Development Department
Kate Tansey, Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Marsha Yamamoto, Employment Development Department

State Board Staff:

Brian McMahon, Executive Director
John Bohart
Joelle Hurst
David Militzer
Beverly Odom
Daniel Patterson
Suzette Smith
Kelly Solari
Nikki Verrett

Welcome and Opening Remarks

The meeting commenced at 10:10 a.m., chaired by Barry Sedlik. He reviewed the agenda and stated that there were three key initiatives before the committee that we are trying to formulate. These topics are not staff driven but through collaboration of the members here, and with the discussions today on the merits of the proposals, the committee will decide how the staff should proceed on each of them. There was also discussion regarding longer-range goals for the committee and approaching future work. Mr. Sedlik stated that if there were any members of the public that have contributions to add to the discussions to participate as necessary.

Action - Approval of September 9, 2005 Meeting Summary of Breakout Session

A minor correction made by Mark Hanson. Mike Curran also stated that there were some additional discussions, not included in the minutes, regarding issues that should be captured in a “parking lot” so we don’t lose them, and that staff is asked to put this list together from the previous meetings. John Bohart responded that the staff are continuing to work on this and will provide it to the Committee members when completed. With notation of the correction, the November 1, 2005 meeting summary was unanimously approved.

Update and Discussion on Three Initiatives

Daniel Patterson provided a brief summary of the three initiatives before the Committee today and what was approved at the November 30th State Board Meeting. A copy of the Committee’s Action Item was provided as information in each member’s agenda packet. He stated that staff had continued to develop the initiatives and had specific proposals for their discussion.

Advancing Low-Income Workers Initiative Proposal:

Brian McMahon introduced this topic by stating the initial work was to focus on advancing low wage workers. The proposal today is to provide greater specificity and to target the chronic employed minimum wage worker, in the 25-54 age group, which represents a significant portion of the workforce - approximately 661,000 people. This initiative is to specifically target the statutory minimum wage worker, those making \$6.75/hour. The Labor Agency has carved out \$1-\$2M from the Governor’s WIA 15% monies to fund a project to target this group. It is anticipated that this category would be included in the next round of Solicitation for Proposals (SFPs), which are issued in the July or August 2006 timeframe. The staff is requesting to form a staff level workgroup, to include local partners, to develop language for an SFP, structured on the principals the Committee had previously identified, (collaborative/sustainable). The SFP should also provide the workers with the tools (numeracy, literacy, etc.) and choice/ability to move within their own industry or opportunities to move outside of current employment.

Mr. McMahon clarified that it would not be comparative incomes, such as the Bay Area, nor at the expense of the other advancing worker 15% projects, but this would function as a second and more focused tier of other low wage worker initiatives funded by 15% monies. We anticipate including in the SFP language sustainability and performance requirements, with the hope that the program extend beyond the 2-year WIA funding period. There were other considerations such as defining chronic, retention period, and life of funding. The workgroup would provide guidance to EDD on what principles and language to include in the SFP and that work should be completed in the next couple of months.

Ms. Carrillo asked what industries are these minimum wage workers in, where are they, and are they in part-time, or full time work? Kate Tansey from Agency responded by saying that the workers are occupying jobs statewide: urban, rural, in industries such as hospitality (more than half in this industry in the 25-54 age group), forestry, services and agricultural sectors.

There were several questions regarding a potential conflict of interest by Committee members participating in the workgroups, as well as who might also have an interest in submitting responses to the SFP. Mr. McMahon said that this question has ramifications for other workgroups, and a definitive answer will be obtained for the Committee regarding any conflict of interest issues.

Mr. Sedlik polled the members, all agreed to authorize the formation of a working group to develop a solicitation for advancing employed minimum wage workers.

Goods Movement Industry Sector Initiative Proposal

Mr. Sedlik provided an update of the Administration's effort in the Goods Movement related industries by stating there was great momentum in this area with the Governor's proposal focusing on infrastructure. The timing is right for this Committee to begin identifying prospects for training in the goods movement area, specifically in construction, for mitigation. At the extent that we can help identify the career ladders for the construction trades and related fields, there is a very good opportunity for us to act and be well positioned to respond. Mr. Sedlik also stated that the larger goods movement industry employs 1 out of 7 workers in the state. There are four goods movement corridors that have statewide tentacles for distribution in California and outside of the state. One of the cornerstones is increasing connectivity in these corridors statewide, which has statewide implications, but may not affect each community.

Mr. Bohart presented this issue to the Committee. He stated that the work of the staff to date was to look at the three proposals and focus on tangible outcomes. We had been provided a copy of the California Community College's (CCCCO) proposal that was submitted to the US Department of Labor for the High Wage/High Growth initiative. Fundamental to the proposal is to develop the capacity to build curriculum, develop a high school pipeline connection, support both incumbent and potential workforce, and include a strong collaboration between the high schools, community colleges and local boards in these three regions. It is also very much industry based. Mr. Bohart asked that the Committee authorize formation of a workgroup to evaluate the proposal to see if there was something in it that would be beneficial to continue the work in the logistics area. The task of the workgroup would be to determine the structure, project design, and if it could, influence the SFP process or determine if there are some other options that the Committee may consider.

After some additional discussion regarding the research data and what the role of the State Board or Committee might be in supporting such a proposal, Mr. Sedlik asked if there was any additional discussion, of which there was none. They all agreed to support further evaluation and development of the CCCCCO proposal and returning to them at a future meeting with recommendations.

Discussion of the Promising Strategies for Local Collaboration Guidance Proposal

Mr. McMahon introduced the third item and provided a summary of the Board Action Item. He stated that it was not the highest priority for immediate action, but at the staff level, we were interested in suggesting what might be a meaningful direction for the Committee to be discussed

by the Committee. He suggested one potential area is to evaluate the degree the Local Workforce Investment Board's (LWIBs) are effective in leveraging resources and other services. One potential area is the development of stronger partnerships, enhancing existing relationships between the Employment Training Panel (ETP) and the LWIBs. The Committee may want to look at barriers to performance or replication of these types of projects in other areas, with the desire to expand those types of operations around the state. We would not look at just ETP programs but other types of funding also. Is the Committee interested in moving in this direction and use this proposal as a framework to move in this direction? Mr. Sedlik asked Mr. McMahon to elaborate on why this topic is under this Committee's business and not some others and does the CWIB have other work related to this. Mr. McMahon responded that it is consistent with the priority areas, themes and strategies approved by the Board for this Committee, and there is no other work being performed by State Board staff in this area.

There were several suggestions by the members on what might be an appropriate avenue for the staff to pursue. Mr. Sedlik asked what this effort could accomplish. Mr. McMahon stated that the challenge we have at the staff level in proceeding, is to narrow it down to a focus where we might proceed on some type of action. If the Committee is interested in moving forward on some type of structure, we need to hone in a bit more. Mr. McMahon reminded Committee members that this was an original charge for this Committee from the State Board, we had discussed it at the last several meetings and strengthening collaboration is included in the State Plan.

The notion of bringing in and strengthening partnerships and collaboration in the One Stops, bringing efficiencies and eliminating overlapping expenditures, at the same time targeting resources through that collaborative structure to achieve some overall goals is really where we are trying to go with this proposal. There was an earlier comment related to development of connections between education and workforce using the Secretary's funding, which may be an interesting way to go with this initiative. He stated that with the amount of work given to the staff to prepare over the next couple of weeks, that staff would go back through this discussion and try and narrow it down for our next discussion and propose some direction for this item. It was agreed that further discussion on this item could take place at a later date.

Discussion of Short-and long-Range Goals

Mr. Curran introduced this topic, asking where the Committee wanted go, what work will it take on in the future, especially after these three initiatives are completed. After we put these recommendations in place, are there, or should there be other things that we will work on? How do we assess the work we have accomplished? Mr. McMahon stated that with the four Committees working on initiatives, a relevant question for the staff is what some reasonable outcomes are, and what the Committee's expectations are. Depending on the initiative, there is an expectation that there will be a continuum of activity and the Committee could be involved in multiple types of outcomes. One might be identifying some best practices, planning guidance to the local practitioners; other outcomes might be influencing the state's Request for Proposal (RFP) process, regulatory or legislative recommendations from the Committee. The minimum wage project we discussed today is very short term with very definable outcomes, but not the case for all. The State Board staff is also going through a staff strategic planning process, during

which they will determine how to best respond with answers to the questions Mr. Curran raised. One of the evaluation steps we are developing is a matrix to critique any initiative that we want to bring before a Committee.

Mr. Curran said that his local board has taskforces that are formed to respond to a specific thing, to complete the work, forward a recommendation, and then walk away. Is this an option for this Committee? Mr. Schell echoed these comments by saying the same old Committee for a long period of time wears out after time. We are at the beginning of the year; let's identify the issues and work on them. Mr. Sedlik asked who is doing the environment scans to see what the issues are, to help us shape what our issues are? One way staff is doing this is through our involvement with the local area advisory group. We brief these members on the work of the Committees and receive input from them. Staff continually communicates with other representatives to help refine the issues and receive input from them. Mr. Villarino spoke of the effort in Kern County where they included economic development data in their local strategic plan. They assign these objectives to an entity to develop outcomes, a response to the strategic goal. These goals provided a guide post for all the partners: community college, local boards, and economic development. Is there a way that the state can provide a vision for where we are going?

Mr. Sedlik responded that there are lots of strategic plans; the Economic Strategy Panel has a state plan. Ms. Carrillo said that when the Board established these Committees, they were charged with certain responsibilities and charter. Where are we with that, it seems that we only have the one open item remaining before us, how do we continue? Mr. Bohart suggested we go back to Mr. Curran's question about the work of the Committee, to go back to the themes and strategies documents developed by the Board at their July session, and issues raised during the two-year planning process from partners and Board members themselves. This would be informative for the Committee to look at again. Staff is in the process of pulling out a list of other goals mentioned in your previous discussions and will have that available for the members at the next meeting. Mr. McMahon stated that there are really broad subject areas in these issues that need to be defined, and that these would be the basis of generating work at the staff level over a period of time. There are other issues that we are involved with, however Committee work is our primary work. We also wanted to be sensitive to the fact that they were not established in perpetuity, and the amount of commitment from each of the members to participate in this work.

Sean Liou said that literacy was just not a question for employees, but for employers too. He gave an example of employers being fined for non-compliance with an aspect of state and federal law. Not intentional, but from not knowing. We need to help our business owners know what the law is. He is working with NOVA to explain to the community what is required and what kind of services the locals can provide. Mr. Bohart said that staff recognizes there is some overlapping work between the Committees and staff are discussing how these Committees might work together. For instance, literacy affects both the Life Long Learning and Business and Industry Committees and how do we bring these Committees together to work together on joint or shared issues.

Mr. Curran suggested that in the framework of it being a new calendar year, we examine what we have been given, including parking lot issues identified by staff, and put them up on a board

and identify and prioritize what we want to/should be working on and get permission through the Administration or State Board to do that work, rather than just the initiatives we have in front of us. Ms. Carrillo said that we might want to look at what the other committees are doing to see if it would be beneficial and we might consider collapsing some of the Committees, as some of the functions overlap. Mr. Sedlik said that we need some mechanism to at least be knowledgeable about what the Committees are doing, and rather than working on them jointly, we may want to assign one Committee and eliminate the overlap. Mr. McMahon suggested that one means of addressing this particular topic is to allow the different committees to provide you a briefing of what work they are doing. All thought this was a good idea. There was no further discussion on this particular item.

Public Comment

Mr. Ralph Zackheim, from the USDOL, Employment and Training Administration, Region 6 introduced himself. He said he was shadowing the different Committees and other meetings to learn. Linda Rogaski from the Employment Development Department interjected that the responsibility of the Committee is that we are a policy setting body, not just for the local boards, but for the entire workforce system. Mr. Curran stated that our charge was to *advise* the State Board and make recommendations for their consideration.

Next Steps

The next meeting will be Thursday March 2nd in Sacramento.

Other Business that May Come Before the Committee

None

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

**California Workforce Investment Board
Targeting Resources Committee
March 2, 2006 Meeting Summary**

**California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) Members and Committee
Members Attending**

Mike Curran, Vice Chair
Elvin Moon
Francis Low for Richard Alarcon
Mark Hanson for Jerry Butkiewicz
David Villarino for Arturo Rodriquez

Board Staff, Partner Staff and Contributors Attending:

Partner Staff:

Michelle Alford-Williams, Department of Rehabilitation
Linda Rogaski, Employment Development Department
Kate Tansey, Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Marsha Yamamoto, Employment Development Staff
Tammie Holloway, Department of Education
Jason Hone, Business Transportation and Housing
Al Tweltridge, Department of Education
Ralph Zackheim, Department of Labor/Employment and Training Agency

State Board Staff:

Brian McMahon, Executive Director
Cathe Rutherford
Daniel Patterson
David Militzer
Joelle Hurst
John Bohart
Moreen Lane
Ray York
Suzette Smith
Teresa Gonzales

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The meeting convened at 10:15 a.m., chaired by Vice Chair, Michael Curran. He announced that the Committee did not have a quorum and therefore is not able to vote on any of the action items. He provided the meeting logistics information to the members and the public and stated that there would be an opportunity for the public to make comments and then reviewed agenda items.

2. Discussion Item – Update on Workgroup Progress

Minimum Wage Worker Initiative

Mr. Patterson provided a summary of how the initiative was defined and eventually approved by the Committee during the January 12 meeting. The workgroup has met 4 times and includes representatives from Employment Department, (EDD), Department of Rehabilitation (DOR), and Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA). They have consulted with local practitioners, as well as performed additional literature reviews from national studies from similar initiatives. The workgroup's schedule is to present the decision/policy points to the Committee in a discussion paper, to consider and make recommendations on at the next meeting. After receiving the Committee's recommendations, the workgroup will continue to work with EDD and LWDA to ensure this funding category is developed and included in the Solicitation for Proposal (SFP). The SFP in the past has been issued in the July/August time frame, and it is anticipated that it will be issued during the approximate time period this year.

There were some questions from the members regarding what the workgroup will provide and what the research has shown, and the workgroup's role of providing recommendations to the Board. Mr. McMahon spoke to the question of funding saying that the exact numbers for the State's WIA allocations are not yet known, but preliminary numbers indicate that the estimate of \$1.2-5M for this initiative is probably not going to change.

Mr. Villarino stated that because of the limited amount of funding for this effort we may want to look at a demonstration project to help us determine how we might want to shape a better-funded initiative in the future. Mr. McMahon stated that this will be a recommendation that the Committee will decide, but that this initiative could very well be a project based assistance program in order to develop a model that can be expanded over time. Mr. McMahon stated that any recommendations should be made to coincide with the next Administration Committee meeting scheduled for late May, as they will approve any language for the SFP. Ms. Low stated that the timeline is quite short in terms of the Committee's effort, but is confident that staff is able to provide this work in time for the Committee to make recommendations to the Board. Mr. Bohart stated that one of the things we are discussing in the workgroup is whether or not there should be an evaluation component as a part of this initiative. But this is another question as to whether or not there will funding for this type of effort.

Mr. Curran asked if there were any comments from the public? There were none.

Workforce Development in the Logistics Industry

Mr. Patterson stated that the Committee has also approved the formation of a workgroup to evaluate the Community College (CCCO) proposal (a copy had been sent to the members) to see if it provided a means, or proposed a framework that the Committee might use to go forward in this area. He highlighted some of the discussion that has taken place with the authors of the proposal - the participation at a CCCO regional forum on Logistics and staff continuing to monitor the work of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BTHA) Administration's Integrating Workgroup for the Goods Movement Action Plan.

The staff's preliminary finding is that the proposal begins to provide an initial framework for a total workforce system response (K-12 pipeline, CCCO training/certificate programs, LWIB involvement, Organized Labor, and Statewide/Regional impact (Central Valley, Oakland/San Francisco Bay Area, Long Beach/Los Angeles, and San Diego). Mr. Patterson briefly mentioned that the current focus of the public hearings of the BTHA Integrating Workgroup is on environmental mitigation and infrastructure priorities - not on development of the workforce. There is still a lot of work to be done in this area, the workgroup will provide additional details, research and recommendations that the Committee might want to consider in responding to the labor and skills shortages in the area of logistics.

Mr. McMahon stated that the Committee has been discussing the skills shortage in the Goods Movement industry as projected from a range of studies. As an initial step we distributed and discussed a proposal from the CCCO that proposed a multi-region framework to standardize curriculum and include employer involvement in a way that can start to generate and develop skills in response to these industry identified shortages. As we go forward we see this as an issue that goes beyond just a CCCO approach. We are beginning to identify ways the Committee and Board can intersect with this proposal in a meaningful way. It is a broad issue with critical skill needs that will be emerging. One of the issues the State Board and this Committee now face is to identify how we can best integrate into the problem to develop some real solutions.

Mr. Curran stated we are not here to figure out how to support the CCCO proposal, rather we should be asking questions about how they viewed the problem, because there are several ways to do so. Our goal is how does this Committee begin to address the skill shortages and how do we develop a comprehensive approach. Ms. Low stated that this is one proposal in one area. We have a lot of training and other programs going on but still have a lot of people making low wages. The job seekers are looking for jobs they have been trained for. This proposal has all the elements that you look for when you are going to invest in a system. We also want to provide opportunities for good jobs with good wages. At the same time we may be developing a model or an approach that we can then apply to other industries.

Mr. McMahon stated that what we are looking for are ways to impact the proposal in the broadest sense and focused way possible to replicate it, grow it, and apply it to other industry sectors.

Mr. Curran spoke to the number of partners that are invested and involved in this approach is an important factor to consider. Mr. Bohart stated that one of our considerations is the CCCO model's replicability. It is an important factor and one of the elements we are evaluating is the replication of the curriculum by CCCO, and the need for the larger partnership, such as business and industry and local boards. Mr. McMahon said the development of a model and approach are probably more in line with what we are looking for rather than a single proposal. Mr. Curran asked how does this show local control and partnership? He also stated that one approach might be sort of an incubator for statewide applicability.

Mr. Villarino said this is an important growth sector linked to our minimum wage initiative, and it is a natural transition to get to higher paying jobs. Mr. Jason Hone of Business Transportation and Housing Agency stated that a piece of the Administration's Action plan includes workforce development in the logistics industry. They are trying to develop criteria and metrics to evaluate projects and this is an opportunity to cross collaborate. Mr. Villarino stated there needs to be investments in labs where there can be hands on learning not just traditional classroom learning and that an important part is the provision of supportive services to assist those who will be going to training classes at the CCCO. Mr. Patterson stated that some of the CCCOs were responding in such a way. Some were offering classes off campus, at employer sites, had the types of labs mentioned by Mr. Villarino, but these efforts were local and individual responses that might be used as models for a larger response.

Al Tweltridge of CDE, stated that hands-on experience is one of the keys in career educational systems, and one of the problems is the lack of the pipeline. The career/vocational system is the secondary system and the development of a systemic perspective has to include CDE. One approach is to create the pipeline using regional approaches, including the Regional Occupational Programs (ROPs), to provide workers for this system. He also stated that one of the Governor's priorities is to create the pipeline and connect the system to the CCCO. The Governor proposed \$20M in grants for creating this relationship that could be a systemic approach for all industries and sectors. This is also an opportunity to leverage some resources.

Mike Curran closed the discussion and will wait for further reports at future meetings.

3. Committee Initiative Assessment Tool

Daniel Patterson stated that one of the concerns the Board and this Committee has is how to evaluate/assess an initiative and ensure that it is linked to the goals and strategies in the State Plan and each Committee's goals. Copies of this document, as it relates to the two Committee initiatives were provided. CWIB staff is looking for some feedback on the form and it's use in the Committees.

Mr. Curran stated that what you are really looking for is the categories on the left hand side, and are there additional items or clarifications that we can provide to make it more useful for us. Mr. McMahon stated that the tool was developed at the CWIB to determine how the initiative translates to the goals and issues for the Committee.

Mr. Villarino stated that one area we may want to consider is the goals and the indicators of performance. Not what the outcomes will be, but performance so that it can be used as an assessment tool to evaluate the project. Mr. McMahon used the Logistics Initiative as an example stating that we will provide X number of trained employees but some less defined results such as best practices, technical assistance, might also be realized.

Mr. Curran asked for comments from the public. There was no comment.

4. Briefing on work of the Special Committees

Mr. Curran introduced this topic as a means to coordinate our effort with the work of the other Special Committees and to help us more clearly identify our priorities.

Teresa Gonzales –Committee on Business and Industry

Ms. Gonzales described the goals and strategies of the Committee. This Committee has formed a workgroup to discuss and provide recommendations in the areas of business resources and to assess the level of business services that are currently out there as part of the system, and what criteria can be developed to begin defining a standard level of service to business in the One Stop system. The second area is in the area of partnerships. The California Manufactures and Technology Association offered to conduct a survey of its members to determine the level of awareness of the One Stop system and issues that their employers are encountering. The survey results will provide a baseline assessment of what is needed in terms of marketing and the level of services being provided. The results of the survey are compiled and she will be presenting them to the Committee at the next meeting.

The third area is a survey with CALED of the Economic Development Centers to identify areas of potential collaboration. The results of this survey are also compiled and they will be providing these results to the Committee during the next meeting.

Mr. Curran asked if the results of their surveys would be shared or published. Ms. Gonzales stated that they would be. Mr. Curran also asked if one of the areas is strategic planning with partners to identify solutions in local areas with EDCs. He asked the question, has she seen anything where local boards and industry have done joint local planning? Ms. Gonzales responded no, but that they are looking at how to incentivize local partners to do this type of planning. Mr. Hanson mentioned the customized training offered in other European countries (Germany, Denmark) are places where they have these partnerships that are really win/win and the One Stops might want to look at how these training providers and corporations work cooperatively. Statewide models are more difficult, but we know there are partnerships that are working effectively. Ms. Gonzales responded by saying that one of the tasks of her Committee is to evaluate the mechanism for identifying and marketing best practice tools. Mr. Villarino stated if the Committee can assist the local areas by suggesting a way to plan together in a meaningful way, that considers economic growth and skills demand, it may be something that this Committee can also use for its' own purposes.

Ray York - Accountability and the Workforce Committee

Mr. York described the issues and strategies of this committee and the active initiatives that are being carried out. The focus of the Committee is to look at identifying efficiencies in the Workforce system of delivery - the One Stop System.

The first initiative is a One Stop Cost Study to assess the efficiencies and determine how these Centers are funded and operating by looking at the direct/indirect costs and associated outcomes. They have contracted with a research team that will use activity based cost accounting methods to begin this work. The case studies will begin with 3-4 One Stops and include each of their partnerships as part of the study. These One Stop Center sites will be a representative sample (as much as possible) of regions throughout California. Following this, there will be an in-depth survey sent out to 20-25 local workforce boards to do a comparison of where the local expenditures are in comparison with the state level funding. There will be an April 3rd kickoff meeting and the duration of the study will be through the end of December 2006

The second initiative is a One Stop Certification process. The Committee felt that it should develop some basic criteria to assist local areas in certifying their local One-Stop Centers. There are a couple of things affecting this certification: SB 293 (Ducheny's bill) identifies a One Stop Certification process that will affect us here in California, and also the federal legislation for the reauthorization of WIA. The workgroup has been established and are planning their first meeting.

Mr. Curran asked if the survey takes into consideration all the people who walk into a One Stop? Mr. York replied that it will take into account all those who are served, using the principle of universal access and will encompass all partners (public, private) who provide and fund services, fully loaded funding, and will also include any contributions from business partners. The exact methodologies are still being worked out.

He also stated that it is the first study of its kind in the nation and has generated a lot of interest and a lot of questions are being asked about it. Mr. Villarino stated that it will be interesting to see what the outcomes are for the amount of funding being provided, as it may be a means to encourage additional funding into the statewide delivery system.

David Militzer –Life Long Learning Committee

Mr. Militzer stated that the charge of the Committee is to improve the education collaboration at all levels and from the workforce development perspective, to help implement this priority as identified in the State Plan. The Committee is focusing on two primary efforts. The first is to provide policy guidance for Life Long Learning to the One Stop system. They are working with EDD to include language in the annual local planning guidance as a means to emphasize life long learning as a central element in workforce development.

The second initiative will address the skills gap in workers and the youth and adults who are disengaged from education. This effort promotes programs of education and workforce collaboration linked to work and is based on models of the Bay Area Gateway program. The CCCO has committed to providing \$15M over three years to support this effort.

Mr. Villarino asked if some of these services could be offered through CBOs, such as courses taught in native languages with a competency test conducted in English. Mr. Militzer stated that literacy is one of the barriers that they will address. Mr. Hanson said that the Labor Council has volunteers that teach, funded by a DOL grant, so these workers can improve their skills/literacy to pass pre-apprentice tests to gain higher wage jobs. Mr. Villarino discussed use of new curriculum (A-G) and it's benefits at local high schools for educational achievement. He asked if the Committee has considered evaluating those school districts that have adopted this curriculum and are we looking at the use of this as a strategy for developing this pipeline of workers. Mr. Militzer said that he would bring this suggestion back to the Life Long Learning Committee for their consideration and asked for some additional information from Mr. Villarino on this topic. Mr. Curran stated that local representatives know that workers need to return to school as they advance in their career. So this Committee will be looking at how workers can return and are returning to the education system to retool their skills in order to advance within their chosen occupation.

Mr. Curran asked if there were any questions from the public on this item. There were no comments.

5. Lunch

6. Committee Short- and Long-Term Goals

Mike Curran recommended that the Committee defer the discussion of short and long terms goals to the next meeting. Mr. Bohart briefly presented the document that lists the Committee's themes, issues and strategies, as well as parking lot issues, based on staff's effort to group like items. Mike Curran recommended that the items be reorganized and then staff to poll each member to determine their individual priorities. Mr. Bohart also mentioned that one of the things the members should consider is how the Committee might stay/keep involved in issues currently being worked by the other Special Committees. Mr. McMahon stated that we would also post this document on the CWIB web site for additional review and comment.

Mr. Curran asked if there were any other comments before we adjourned.

7. Next Steps

Staff will poll members to determine the date of the next meeting and reformat the issues/strategies document for members' review and prioritization.

There were no further comments. Meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

**California Workforce Investment Board
Committee Initiative Assessment**

Targeted Resources Committee

Assessment Criteria	Explain
Source of Initiative	
General Purpose/Goals	
Consistency with 2-Yr Plan Priorities and Themes (include issues/strategies)	Policy Priorities: Themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
Specific Tangible Outcomes	
Benefits (short-term, long-term, who benefits, etc.)	
Dependencies/Influences with Other Committees/Board Work	

**California Workforce Investment Board
Committee Initiative Assessment**

Timeline for Completion	
Expanded Partners/Contributors (beyond committee members, staff team)	
Internal Staff Resource Commitment	
Partner Staff Resource Commitment	
Financial Resources (requirements, sources, etc.)	
Local Participation/Impact	

Other questions: